

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment:

Claim 13 has been corrected to place the recitation of “from the first material layer” where it was previously placed by the Amendment of February 3, 2006. As such, claim 13 now has correct markings indicating claim additions and deletions.

Allowability of Claims:

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s continued consideration of his application and the amendments and remarks set forth herein. By this amendment changes have been made in the certain claims as set forth above to overcome the Examiner’s objections and rejections and more concisely claim and describe the present invention. Claims 1-21 remain in the application for reconsideration by the Examiner. The Examiner’s allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5-7, 17, and 18 have been objected to due to certain informalities related to antecedent basis issues. The Applicant has amended claims 5 and 17 as indicated above to overcome this objection for claims 5 and 17 and therefore for the identified claims depending therefrom.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under Section 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. According to the Examiner certain limitations added to the claims in the amendment accompanying the RCE are not disclosed in the specification.

To overcome the rejection, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9 and 13 as indicated above. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at paragraph [0030]. It is further suggested that the claims as amended are patentably distinct from the art previously cited during prosecution of the instant case, including the patents to Iyer (6,433,404) and Wang (6,703,263) cited in the immediately previous office action. The remarks set forth in the amendment accompanying the RCE explaining the patentably distinguishing features between the instant invention and the Iyer and Wang patents are not prejudiced by the claim amendments set forth above.

With the amendments to independent claims 1, 9, and 13, the dependent claims 2-8, 10-12, and 14-21 dependent therefrom should be in condition for allowance.

The Applicant has attempted to comply with all of the points raised in the Office Action and it is believed that claims 1-21 remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance, responsive to the foregoing amendments and discussion. It is respectfully requested

that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and objections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all the claims pending in the application.

If a telephone conference will assist in clarifying or expediting this Proposed Amendment or the claim changes made herein, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/12/2006
Customer No. 46900
Mendelsohn & Associates, P.C.
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 405
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

/ Yuri Gruzdkov/
Yuri Gruzdkov
Registration No. 50,762
Agent for Applicant
(215) 557-8544 (phone)
(215) 557-8477 (fax)